

Remarks

Claims 1-29 have been amended to more precisely claim the present invention. Support for these claim amendments can be found beginning in paragraph [039] of the specification and continuing through paragraph [070]. No claims have been canceled. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claim 28 has been objected to due to informalities. Claim 28 has been amended to overcome this objection.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1 through 14, 17, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article "Network Caching Guide: Optimizing Web Content Delivery" by Michael A. Goulde (hereafter "Goulde reference"). The Goulde reference generally describes network caching techniques to optimize content delivery in a network by identifying objects that are static and dynamic in nature and then caching those static objects for quicker deliver to a client. For example, the Goulde reference describes the use of header information to expire entire documents as noted on page 27 to manage the cache. Each object as described throughout the Goulde reference appears to be an entire document, file, or web element.

In contrast, the present invention as now claimed in amended claims requests are responded to on a network by dividing individual documents or objects into static and dynamic portions. The static portions of the document are stored and served from in a cache memory logically close to the client and the dynamic portions of the document are served from the originating server or at least a server that may not be logically close to the client. In other words, the present invention as claimed describes a content delivery method that goes beyond the teachings in the Goulde reference by identifying and dividing up individual documents into static and dynamic portions. Subsequently, the static portions are cached to logically local memory. In short, the Goulde reference does not teach manipulating static and dynamic portions of a single document as specified in independent claims 1 and 12.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over the Goulde reference for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Claims 13-14, 17, 18, and 20 depend from claim 12 and therefore are allowable over the Goulde reference for the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable.

Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), the Goulde reference fails to teach the present invention as claimed in claims 1 through 14, 17, 18, and 20 and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 15, 16, 19, and 21-29 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Goulde reference. In view of the amendments to independent claims 12, 21 and 25, the Applicant respectfully suggests that the Goulde reference fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the amended claims. In particular, as stated previously when discussing independent claims 1 and 12, the Goulde reference fails to suggest or teach all of the elements of the presently pending independent claims 12, 21, and 25. For example, the Goulde reference does not teach identifying and dividing up an individual document into static and dynamic portions. Subsequently, caching the static portions in logically local memory and serving the static portion from the memory and the dynamic portion from the network.

Claims 15, 16, and 19 depend from claim 12 and therefore are allowable over the Goulde reference for the same reasons that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 21 and therefore are allowable over the Goulde reference for the same reasons that claim 21 is allowable. Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and therefore are allowable over the Goulde reference for the same reasons that claim 25 is allowable.

Therefore, under 35 USC §103(a) the Goulde reference fails to teach the present invention as claimed in claims 15, 16, 19, and 21-29 and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Applicant has reviewed the other references cited the by Examiner and determined that they do not teach or suggest the present invention.

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-29 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

DIGITAL RIVER, INC.
By attorneys/agents:

MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER, PLLP
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 4850
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 332-8200

Date: 14 July 2005

By 
Shawn B. Dempster, Registration No. 34,321

P:\Client Files\D-G\Digital River D33\D33-017-01-US - Content Delivery Network Using Differential Caching\050714 response to oa.doc